## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable consideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application, with Claims 1, 4, 6, 9-12, 15,17, and 19-22 amended by the present amendment. No new matter has been presented.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 4, 6, 9-12, 15, 17 and 20-22 were objected; Claims 1, 5, 9, 12, 16 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6, 671,514 by Cedervall et al. (hereinafter Cedervall). Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication that Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10, 11, 13-15, 17-19, 21 and 22 were allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response to the objection to Claims 1, 4, 6, 9-12, 15, 17 and 20-22 regarding informalities, the language has been reviewed and clarified. In light of the above mentioned changes to the claims, applicants respectfully submit that the objections have been overcome. Claims 16, 19 and 22 have been amended to correct additional informalities noticed by Applicant.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Cedervall, the claim has been amended to clarify that the base stations in the network are controlled by a control unit. Support for this amendment to the claim is found in Applicant's originally filed specification.[1] In Applicant's specification, Figures 1 and 3, the control unit is labeled 10. No new matter is added.

Briefly recapitulating, amended Claim 1 is directed to a method of determining the position of a mobile station in a mobile telecommunication network. The network includes a plurality of base stations controlled by a control unit, designed to adopt at least a first state

[1] Specifications, Figure 1 and 3, page 6, lines 6-12, page 8 lines 12-14, original Claim 12.

corresponding to periods of transmission of signals useful to the mobile station for determining its position, and a second state corresponding to periods of silence during which no signal is transmitted. The control unit arranges the periods of transmission and the periods of silence in cycles including at least one period of silence, so that a cycle allocated to a base station is identical to a cycle allocated to any base station adjacent to it, but is offset in time from it. In the network disclosed by Cedervall there is no control unit as shown in Figures 1, 2 and 3. In Cedervall, if the periods of silence of neighbor base stations overlap, a station may transmit to the pertinent station a time signal, for adjusting the idle periods such as they do not coincide anymore, or may adjust its own idle period to avoid conflict.[2] However, the arrangement of the periods of silence in Cedervall is done via interaction of the base stations in the network, while in the Applicant invention the arrangement is done by the claimed control unit. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the claim amendments and the above discussion, the rejections of Claim 1 and dependent Claims 2-9 thereafter are overcome.

Regarding Claim 12 rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Cedervall, Applicant notes that the presence and the role of the control unit were recited in the original form of the claim. Claim 12 has been amended by adding a comma to more clearly accentuate the presence and role of the control unit. In light of the above presented discussion relative to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention as claimed in Claim 12 is patentably distinguishable from Cedervall. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of Claim 12 and dependent Claims 13-22 thereafter are overcome.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 5 (method claim) and corresponding Claim 16 (apparatus claim) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Cedervall, in the section of the reference indicated in the Office Action as pertinent to rejecting these claims, it is

[2] Cedervall, Column 7, lines 45-65

disclosed that location method is based on time differences of arrival (TDOA) trilateration technique.[3] The TDOA techniques are mentioned in Applicant's specification as prior art.[4] The reference does not teach or suggests including in each signal cycle "in addition to at least one telecommunication signal and at least one period of silence, a period of transmitting specific location signals" as claimed by the Applicant and illustrated in Figure 2b as well as described in Applicant's specification.[5] That is, the TDOA technique of Cedervall relies on measurements of normal transmission signals, not specific location signals. Thus, Claims 5 and 16 distinguish over Cedervall for this reason and for the reasons described relative to independent Claims 1 and 12.

Accordingly, in view of the present amendment and in light of the previous discussion, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request an early and favorable action to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Michael Monaco
Registration No. 52,041

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 08/03)

GJM/MEMO\kkn

[3] Cedervall, Column 5, line 59 to Column 6, line 4.
[4] Specification, page 1 line 32 to page 2 line 10.
[5] Specification, page 7 line 12 to page 8 line 5.